Vol. 2, No. 1 January 1980

THE STAR OF THE EAST

ܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ

an ecumenical journal dealing specially with the oriental and eastern orthodox churches.

P. O. Box 98, Kottayam — 686 001, Kerala, India.

THE STAR OF THE EAST

ܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ

An Ecumenical Journal dealing specially with the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Churches.

SOPHIA CENTRE, ORTHODOX SEMINARY, P. B. 98,
KOTTAYAM—686 001, KERALA, S. INDIA.

Chief Editor

Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios Metropolitan

Editorial Board

Mathews Mar Coorilos
Geevarghese Mar Osthathios
Revd. Fr. K. G. Thomas
Revd. Fr. T. J. Joshua
Revd. Fr. M. Jacob Kurian
Mr. P. A. Oommen
Dr. Philipose Mar Theophilos
Revd. Dr. V. C. Samuel
Revd. Fr. C. G. Geevarghese
Revd. Dr. K. M. George
Mr. K. M. Mathew
Mr. C. C. Joseph

Editorial Advisors

Revd. Fr. Stewart, Cambridge Brotherhood, Delhi-6
Revd. Fr. Hambye S. J., Vidya Jyothi, Delhi-6
Very Revd. Archpriest Vitaly Borovoi,
Representative of the Russian Orthodox Church, W. C. C., Geneva
Revd. Fr. Ion Bria, C. W. M. E., W. C. C., Geneva
Prof. Nikos Nissiotis, Athens, Greece

Printer and Publisher: Revd. Dr. K. M. George

Business Manager: Dn. George Paulose

THE STAR OF THE EAST

Vol. 2 No. 1 January 1980

CONTENTS

Page

EDITORIAL .. 3

THE MONASTERY OF ST. MACARIUS IN THE EGYPTIAN DESERT .. 7

THE ELEMENT OF MODERNITY IN MODERN PHILOSOPHY
—*Dr. Paulos Gregorios* .. 14

DIALOGUE BETWEEN ORIENTAL ORTHODOX AND BYZANTINE ORTHODOX
—*Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra* .. 23

LOVE AS THE GOOD .. 28

THE MIXED CATHOLIC–ORTHODOX COMMISSION FOR THEOLOGICAL DIALOGUE
—*L'osservatore Romano* .. 31

JOINT DECLARATION OF POPE JOHN PAUL II AND PATRIARCH DIMITRIOS I .. 34

NEWS AND VIEWS .. 36

FORM IV
(See Rule 8)

1. Place of publication	:	Kottayam
2. Periodicity of its publication	:	Quarterly
3. Printer's Name	:	Rev. Dr. K. M. George
Whether citizen of India?	:	Yes
Address	:	P. B. 98, Kottayam, Kerala,
4. Publisher's name	:	Rev. Dr. K. M. George
Whether citizen of India?	:	Yes
Address	:	P. B. 98, Kottayam, Kerala.
5. Editor's Name	:	Dr. Paulos Gregorios
Whether citizen of India?	:	Yes
Address	:	P. B. 98, Kottayam, Kerala.
Names and addresses of individuals who own the newspaper and partners or share holders holding more than one per cent of the total capital.	:	Dr. Paulos Gregorios P. B. 98, Kottayam, Kerala.

I Rev. Dr. K. M. George, here by declare that particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Sd/-

22-2-1980 REV. DR. K. M. GEORGE

Editorial

The last few months have seen some sharp turns in international relations; the breakdown in relations between the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. is of a more frightening nature than that in the wake of the confrontation between Kennedy and Khrushchev around the Cuban Missile Crisis.

There seems to be a kind of bankruptcy of resources for international crisis management. The machinery for conflict settlement seems to have broken down under the impact of a war mentality—thinking in terms of enemies and allies, a pervasive loss of objectivity, an unwillingness to understand reality from the protagonist's perspective, and a climate of high tension and nervous anxiety.

The fear of war appears more graphic in the west, particularly in Europe. Since the second World War, Europe and America have managed to have all wars fought on Asian, African or Latin American territory—in South Africa, in the Middle East, in Somalia, Ethiopia, in Indochina, in Cuba and Nicaragua; a recent study enumerates almost 100 local wars since 1945. Many of these are fuelled or fomented by powers outside these continents, but the cost has been billed to the poorer nations.

The present tension also serves the interests mainly of the armament manufacturers, with their allies and sub-contractors; these are the people who stand to benefit from every war, large or small, and from every increase in the defence budgets of nations.

The armaments manufacturers also have significant control over the media who cooperate in whipping up a war hysteria which can help raise defence budgets. The arms manufacturers can also find good markets among dissident minorities—in Afghanistan, Pakistan and India, provided the dissidents can be financially and otherwise helped by U. S. A., U. S. S. R., China, Libya etc. who have resources as well as personnel for training and equipping insurgents.

In a world where the crying problems of poverty and injustice stubbornly refuse to be resolved, mainly due to the affluent nations being unwilling to foot the bill, it is scandalous that such enormous sums of money can be spent on fruitless armaments. This tragedy remains the most powerful indictment on the present human situation, about which the media are largely silent, and the people not yet fully aware.

An even greater tragedy perhaps is that religious elements—whether Christian or Muslim—do not take this tragedy seriously·

They are being sucked into the game of war hysteria and the false propanganda that Islam is threatened by Atheism or that Christendom is threatened by unbelievers. Neither is true, because true religious faith is never extinguished by physical or military force. Religious elements should have the spiritual vitality to face persecutions, and can only be strengthened and deepened through suffering.

What seems important at this juncture is to face reality as it is, without fear or panic. Christian churches need to bring an atmosphere of calmness and sobriety into the overheated atmosphere of emotional tension and irrationality.

Christians cannot certainly justify the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. But they should also understand events in the context of their whole development. In order to do this we still need more information; but in the light of what we know, certain comments can be made.

As *Time* Magazine's diplomatic Correspondent Strobe Talbott remarked (*Time*, January, 28th, 1980), Afghanistan, unlike Iran and Nicaragua was not in the perimeter of America's "defense" lines—mainly CENTO.

In 1978 April there was the first coup, when Noor Mohammed Taraki overthrew President Mohammed Daoud, and established a Marxist regime, with Babrak Karmal and strong-man Hafiz Amin as his two lieutenants—with inevitable mutual rivalry between them. The first coup was not Soviet engineered, as *Time* admits.

But the U. S. A. saw this as a danger signal and began secretly arming insurgents and dissidents against the Taraki regime. The C. I. A. started playing the game of dividing Karmal and Amin further. Karmal was pushed off to Czechoslovakia by Amin's forces.

The second coup also did not have any Soviet engineering behind it. It was Amin who brutally murdered Taraki by smothering him with a pillow and suffocating him by squeezing his throat. Amin suspected Taraki of trying to oust him and he acted without consulting the Soviets to kill Taraki, against whom there were no charges.

It was at this time that Soviet military advisers began coming in. One of them a deputy Defence Minister of the USSR was killed, probably by Amin. There are reports that Amin started making contacts with the C. I. A. to protect himself against any Russian recrimination for the death of one of their generals in Afghanistan.

Taraki's followers, still strong in the Government got hold of Amin and forced him to ask for an intervention of Soviet troops. The Tarakists probably knew about Amin's approaches to the C. I. A., in any case Amin was a tyrant who set out brutally to eliminate all personal opposition. Legally it was Amin who invited the Soviet troops; the Soviets can argue that their intervention in Afghanistan

is not of the same kind as that of the U. S. A. in Cuba or Vietnam, or China in Vietnam and Kampuchea, or Vietnam in Kampuchea.

If the Soviet Union had not massively intervened, Afghanistan would have been taken over by tribal dissidents with American, Chinese and Pakistani military support. This does not however justify Soviet take over of Afghanistan. That the U. N. General Assembly has condemned by a vast and impressive majority. The Soviet Union has now been warned that she can also lose friends, as China did in consequence of her invasion of Vietnam.

The west has capitalized on the Afghan situation to spread a new wave of anti-communism and to create deep discord between Islamic nations and the Soviet Union. They also have succeeded in upping defence budgets, thus temporarily relieving an economy which is still in doldrums.

The Soviet Union must leave Afghanistan; but this does not mean that they should leave it to be controlled by the C. I. A., the Chinese military advisers and Pakistan, who are all behind the insurgents. The insurgent problem would have to be resolved before the Soviets pull out. The west is hoping that by arming dissidents to create a civil war situation in Afghanistan, they can keep their finger in the pie.

Afghanistan is an issue where we can expect new developments in a few months. There is real danger of war, though there are signs that sanity may prevail. It is important that Christians are not swept away either by the emotional wave of war hysteria or by the propaganda wave of false pretenses.

The Monastery of St. Macarius in the Egyptian Desert *

(Wadi el Natroun)

By A monk of the monastery of St. Macarius

The monastery of St. Macarius is situated in the desert of Scete in Egypt, between Cairo and Alexandria. It was founded in 360 by St. Macarius, the Egyptian. More than 4,000 monks coming from many distant lands had accepted him as their spiritual father. Among the monks were Egyptians, Greeks, Ethiopians, Armenians, Nubeans, Palestinians, Italians, the French and the Spanish. There were scholars, philosophers, people belonging to high nobility and simple illiterate men among them. Since the 4th century monastic life continues unbroken in this monastery.

In 1969 under the spiritual guidance of Fr. Matha Meskin about a dozen monks entered the monastery and reconstructed it both spiritually and architecturally. Till that time these monks had lived away from the world in the desert of Wadi el Rayyan, about 50 kilometres from the south of Fayyoum. Some 10 years they had lived a very strict hermetic life, in the spirit of the early desert fathers, with the same simplicity, the same total renunciation of the world and its cares, the same profound experience of divine love, the same total confidence in divine providence in the midst of the dangerous conditions of the desert. This period gave the most favourable occasion to these monks to establish themselves in divine love and to unite themselves in Christ in the spirit of the Gospel.

This group left the Wadi el Rayyan in 1969 in obedience to the call of Patriarch Cyril VI, who asked then to go to the monastery of St. Macarius and renew it. The Patriarch received these men, blessed them, assuring them of his prayers invoking Divine Grace upon the spiritual father Matta el Meskin, so that through him the desert may blossom with thousands of monks. At that time the monastery had only six old monks and its ancient buildings were facing total ruin. Therefore the new group was warmly welcomed by the Superior Amba Michael.

---

* Translated from the French, courtesy *Irenikon* 1978, No. 2.

At present under the Patriarchate of Pope Shenouda III, (who was responsible for reconstructing the monasteries of Amba Bishoi and Baramus) after seven years of incessant activity of spiritual and material reconstruction, the monastery of St. Macarius has more than 60 monks. Most of them are university graduates and before entering the monastery were exercising different professions as agronomists, doctors, professors, engineers, pharmacologists etc. All live together in great spiritual unity in the spirit of the Gospel, practising brotherly love and the continuous Prayer of the Heart. They are all guided by the same spiritual father who preserves in the monastery the unity of mind. The renewal is manifested also in the attention given to daily offices and other liturgical prayers because the monks by this spiritual practice and serious study seek to restore the ecclesial spirit of the monastcism of the early centuries.

The Reconstruction of the Monastery

The construction of the new buildings in the monastery designed and executed by the competent monks themselves is almost over. These buildings contain more than 150 cells (each cell has three parts; one for work, one for sleep and one for cooking) A big refectory where the monks come together once a day for the 'Agape' meal, a new library and a new guest house with several reception rooms and a good number of individual rooms for those who make retreats or for other visitors. There is a whole complex of other buildings for the common kitchen, workshops etc. The monastery occupies some 10 acres of land. Care has also been taken to restore the ancient monuments of the monastery. This delicate work was done under the direction of some of the best archaeologists. These specialists have very much appreciated the interest of the monks in the field of archaeology.

The Agricultural Project

On the request of the monks the Egyptian Government has offered some 350 acres of desert to the monastery for cultivation and also to establish a professional training centre for the youth. Various professions and techniques will be taught there. The construction of the buildings necessary for this agricultural and industrial project is already underway about a kilometre away from the monastery. Dairy farms have already been started and also plantations of Olives and Fig trees. The advantage of this Project is that it will combine spiritual and moral orientation with professional training.

Our resources

We have already spent about a million Egyptian pounds without having any permanent funds or other stable financial resources.

The monastery has no bank account and is not supported by any organization. It never announces publicly its financial needs except before the Lord in a common prayer offered for this purpose. The money comes to us in the form of daily gifts as much as we need, often in miraculous ways which give assurance that God really cares for this great undertaking botb materially and spiritually.

Conditions for admission

The only condition for admission placed before the new candidate by the spiritual father is, as follows in his own words: "that he must have felt in his heart at least once the love of God." For it is the love of the Lord which unites us and continue to rule our community life from day to day. We have no other rule or goal than to submit ourselves to the will of God because of our love for him. This divine will is declared to us by his word in the Holy Scriptures. Thus our main occupation is to meditate unceasingly in the Word of God both Old and the New Testaments. Here lies the source of our dynamism, of our renewed thirst for God and our ever increasing love for human beings.

The rule of the Monastery

Love is the only one rule of the monastery, love without conditions and without limits as it has been revealed to us on the cross. This love is at the same time the dyanamic and the end of all other actions, of our efforts and our sacrifices. Most of the monks are much advanced in the experience of divine love. The spiritual father (59 years old) is the father of the community in general and of each monk in particular. He has now finished 30 years of monastic life. It is he who helps each one of us to discern the plan of God for our lives. He is a living rule who can adopt himself to each particular case, to each monk and to each particular occasion. He continues to renew himself and to ascend with each monk the path which leads to God. His continual inner renaissance refreshes the whole community. We are not guided by previously conceived principles, but it is the Spirit of God especially through the spiritual father, who guides us. "Where there is the Spirit of God, there is freedom" (2 Cor. 3 : 17). The aim of the spiritual father is first of all to live according to the Spirit, according to this inner divine manifestation which always agrees with the early fathers of the church He leaves to the Lord the care of transmitting to his spiritual sons this inner experience of their father. So that they may also live according to the inner freedom of the Spirit. That is why he is very careful not to impose his own personality on others, but to let each one develop himself freely according to his own vocation and his own spiritual temperament. Thus any discerning visitor can easily see the unity of mind of all the monks as well as the well developed personality

of each of them. In this way spiritual men having an experience of God and knowing how to conduct themselves according to the inner light of the Spirit, are shaped among us. It is this type of people that the world of today needs most urgently.

We have no rules for penitence or punishment because love is more efficient than punishment. The sense of being strangers on this earth makes it easy for us to submit ourselves to one another by the love for Christ.

A Day of the Monk

We have no fixed schedule. The major part of the time is left to the discretion of the monk, according to the advice of the spiritual father. However the first bell rings at 2'o clock in the night for the personal prayer of the monk said in his own cell—midnight Psalms, penitential and personal prayers. A second bell rings at 3 for our common midnight praise in the Chapel sung in the Coptic language. These are selected chants from the Bible (Exodus 15, Ps. 1: 35, Deut. 3, Ps. 148-150) which sing the praise of God the Creator and Saviour of the Universe. Our liturgical chanting is adopted as much as possible to the most ancient and authorised musical system of the Coptic Church. With one heart and one mouth we sing the praises of the Lord and the harmonious combination of our voices becomes an expression of the fusion of our souls. All the monks are conscious that by participating in the daily praise and sharing the common meal, they taste every day, by anticipation, the blessedness of the Kingdom to come. At 6'o clock this celebration comes to a close with the morning office.

Unity of Work and Prayer

After the morning office everybody begins the work assigned to him by the spiritual father. Often this work corresponds to the profession of the monk before joining the monastery. The monk continues his work in the atmosphere of praise in which he was during the early hours of the day. Thus he begins to taste the mystery of the unity between his work and the praise of God. If he is steady, his work will be automatically transformed; the tiring and monotonous work which was the result of a curse (In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread; Gen. 3: 19) becomes an unceasing praise of God and love of brethren. All work in the monastery is thus transfigured in the same spiritual activity whatever be the kind of the work done. Every work is carried out under the direct supervision of the spiritual father who possesses a rich experience, in both theory and practice in various fields. He is always eager to give advice, to correct and to guide. He brings to light the defects of the soul beginning with the defects of the behaviour of the monk and the way in which he carries out his work. Thus for the monk this practical life becomes

an unique occasion to train himself, to make progress and to put into practice the spiritual principles which he has learned. The spiritual father has no interest in the work for its own sake or in its success because they are only occasions for him to correct and guide the inner life of the monk. His interest is always directed to the integrity of soul, its growth and its maturity.

He never separates the material order from the spiritual one. The whole of our life even in its most material details must contribute to the spiritual progress of each monk and of the community in general, "for the equipment of the Saints, for the building up of the Body of Christ" (Eph. 4: 12). We have the deep conviction that through these little things which we do on earth, it is our heavenly vocation that is being accomplished. This unity in our life between the material and the spiritual is a very important measuring rod of our spirituality. Because the role of the spiritual father is not limited to guiding the inner life alone, but is extended to all material, psychological and physical aspects in all their details, we have no rigid schedule which separates the time of prayer from the time of work. Throughout the day, we think that we have only one essential task to be accomplished; to present ourselves to the Lord Jesus Christ in a total sacrifice of love and to lift our hearts in an unceasing prayer even in the midst of the hardest work and to experience the peace of Christ which surpasses all intelligence.

A visitor who observes the monks in work will not be able to distinguish the veterans from the beginners or the superior from the simple monk. The work unites them in intimate love and real humility.

The Common Meal and the Assembly of the Community

At noon we get together in the refectory to sing the midday office followed by the one common meal of the day. During the meal we listen to readings from the Fathers. The evening meal and the breakfast (for the weak and the sick) are taken individually in the cell. The time and the quantity are indicated by the spiritual father, according to each one's capacity to fast and the kind of work assigned to him. From time to time the spiritual father calls us together in the Church for spiritual instruction. But this is not done with any rigid regularity; it is occasional and depends on the inspiration which the spiritual father receives from God, and according to the need of the community. On Sunday evenings we have a meeting for extempore prayers in which everybody expresses freely the feelings of his heart. This is the time for presenting to the Lord all the needs both spiritual and material of our community. We think that this prayer meeting is essential for keeping "the unity of spirit" (Eph. 4: 3) in our community.

The Eucharistic Liturgy

According to the tradition of the desert fathers we have the Eucharistic Liturgy only once in a week on Sunday morning. It begins with the office of praise at 2 o'clock and ends towards 8 o'clock and is followed by an Agape meal. It is through this Eucharistic celebration that our community becomes the Body of Christ and not simply a human gathering. That is why liturgy cannot be the prayer of an individual, not even of a section of the community, but essentially of the whole community gathered together in the Church around the sacrificial lamb to celebrate the marriage supper of the lamb (Revelation 19: 19).

The place of the hermetic life in our community

Although we live in community we think that the vocation of the monk is fully realized through the life of solitude in the desert. When the spiritual father finds any monk to be sufficiently mature to live alone, he is advised to do so in some grottos in the mountain. But even before this some monks are given permission to taste the life of solitude for short periods, while they are still in the community.

Our Vocation with regard to the World

The monastery receives a large number of visitors every day, sometimes up to one thousand a day. Many visitors, both Egyptian and foreign, seek blessings, from the holy spots sanctified by the tears and prayers of saintly monks known to the whole world.* Also the monastery deputes some monks for receiving the visitors, listening to them and directing their spiritual lives. During the summer vacation the monastery provides possibilities for retreat for young people. Priority is given to priests and lay people who are in charge of Sunday Schools and who come for their spiritual preparation in the monastery. By the many writings of the spiritual fathers (more than 40 books and about 200 articles), the monastery plays an important role in the spiritual awakening of the Coptic Church We publish also a monthly magazine "Morcos" especially meant for the youth. The many sermons of the spiritual father recorded on cassettes circulate among the Copts. The monastery has started a modern press for the publication of ancient manuscripts and other books in several languages. We receive all visitors irrespective of their religious convictions or confessions. This is done with sincere love and without any ulterior motive.

* Makarios The Great, Makarios of Alexandria, John the Little, Paphnutius, Isidore, Arsenius, Moses the Black, Poemen, Isaiah of Scete, Serapion and others.

The monastery has good relationships with several monasteries abroad. Several monks from these monasteries come and stay with us as guests. We have good relationship also with the Egyptian Government; some of our monks were previously officers or soldiers in the Egyptian army. The political opinions of Fr. Matta El Meskin are taken with due weight and seriousness in government circles. In his book on "the Church and the State", he pleads for the separation of the Church and the State. In some of his other books he warns against the tendency of minorities not to be open to others and to look down upon them.

The monk is fully conscious of his responsibilities with respect to the world and to the Church. He considers himself to be a representative before God for the suffering world. He offers prayers and sacrifices for the redemption of the world.

Our Monastic life and the Unity of the Church

Christian unity means for us life together in Christ in love. In love, barriers are automatically abolished and differences disappear. It is the unique Christ and none else who gathers us together into his holy presence.

Theological dialogue is necessary but we leave it to competent persons. As for us we feel that the Christian unity exists in Christ, and consequently we discover the fulness of unity among us in proportion to our union with Christ. "If any one is in Christ he is a new creation" (2 Cor. 5: 17). In this new creation there is no division but only one new man (Eph. 2: 15). Although we live fully our Orthodox faith and are conscious of its truth and spiritual wealth we know that in Christ "there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, scythian, slave or free man; Christ is all and in all" (Col. 3: 11).

We have found the best means of union with Christ in the monastic life and consequently in the realization of the new creation which gathers together men "of all nations, races, peoples and languages" (Rev. 7: 9) is the unity of spirit and heart. The special charisma of the monastery of St. Macarius has always been to bring together men of different character, of different social classes and of a variety of races.

All these people lived in great spiritual harmony thanks to the spirit of love which had always been the dynamic of St. Macarius. We hope that the desert of Scete will become once again the place of reconciliation and unity for all the peoples of the earth in Jesus Christ.

The Element of Modernity in Modern Philosophy

An Epistemological Analysis*

(Dr. Paulos Gregorios)

"Modern Philosophy" is a term widely used, but seldom with any precision of meaning. In one sense it could be said that the absence of reference to religious authority constitutes modernity. But such a definition cannot be sustained, both because in the two acknowledged fathers of modern philosophy, Rene Descartes and Immanuel Kant, one finds various references to religious authority, and because there have been many others in the history of universal philosophy before the modern period who have philosophized without appeal to religious athority.

Particularly in Descartes, one sees his whole literary activity permeated with an anxious desire not to give offence to traditional religion. Leibniz tried actually to correlate his metaphysics carefully with the religious tradition. Spinoza, precisely because he radically differed in his conception of God from the traditional notion, got into serious trouble with religious authorities.

One could try another track - that of substance and function. Is it not true that this is what characterizes modern philosophy - that it is concerned more with function than with substance? The difficulty is that we are not as sure of that distinction as we once were. Substance has always remained a dubitable philosophical concept, long before modern philosophy. It has already been argued, both by 4th century (AD) Greek philosophy, especially by the Christian philosophers, and by the Indian philosophical tradition in general, both Haindava and Bauddha, that matter does not have any substance, that even at the *vyavaharika* level, reality is constituted by *gunas* rather than *vastus*. Hence it becomes difficult to make a substance-function distinction or take the marginalization of substance as the distinguishing characteristic of "modern philosophy".

Perhaps shall we find the characteristic nature of "modern philosophy" by investigating its origins, what it was reacting from,

* A paper read at the Indian Philosophical Congress, Madras 79.

what it sought to establish, and what it has achieved or failed to achieve in relation to its objectives?

The origins of modern philosophy are to be sought in the same region as that of natural science. Natural science in the 17th century set itself to "understand Nature", leaving only what is outside nature or super-nature to theology and metaphysics. Modern philosophy grew up as part of this new "Natural Science". Of course, that early natural science was, at least on the surface, very theologically grounded. It was God (with whose revelation in Scripture theology busied itself) who revealed himself also in Nature. On the surface, the two were united, the natural and the supernatural, in God. The last cause or First cause was always God. For Jakob Boehme and Giordano Bruno God is *Urgrund* and *Ursache* or *principium* and *causa* of nature.

At least in Jakob Boehme, philosophy is also concerned about the knowledge of nature - 'Eternal Nature' as he would call it.[1] But the important thing in the Renaissance of Europe was the separation of philosophy from dogmatic theology - a separation that can be traced back at least to Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century. But the "philosophy of nature" remained heavily dependent on the older metaphysics of the Greeks - of Plato and Plotinus, of Aristotle and the Stoics, of Heracleitus and Pythagoras.

It was the turning from the older metaphysics to a more empirically grounded metaphysics that marks the transition, both in natural science and in modern philosophy. But the empiricism of the Humanists like Ludovico Vives, Campanella, Telesio, Sanchez and Montaigne could still not overcome the dualism between inner perception and outer reality. Campanella for example, had to identify knowledge with feeling,[2] though all of these mentioned agreed on the principle of starting with 'facts'.

Bacon, of course, was pursuing "true knowledge of Nature", as distinct from the tradition or the "idols of the tribe" (*idola tribus*), from the "idols of the cave" (*idola specus*) by which one lapses into the cave of solipsism (a caveat against the cave of Plato), from the vulgar misconceptions of the common people - the *idola fori* or idols of the market place, and from *idola theatri* or the illusory phantasms of credulously accepted theories.

1. Jacob Boehme *Six Theosophic Points* Ann Arbor Paperbacks, Univ. of Michigan, 1958.
2. See Wilhelm Windelband, *A History of Philosophy* — Vol: II - *Renaissance, Enlightenment, Modern.* Harper Torchbooks, New York, 1958, Part IV, Ch. 1; 29 pp. 376-377.

Baron Bacon's negative thrust was directed against scholasticism and the authority of tradition; his positive effort is for an unprejudiced examination of reality and the finding out of things for oneself by clear and cogent reasoning. Wilhelm Windelband cites Bacon as a clear example of the German Philosopher's general dictum:

> "All beginnings of modern philosophy have in common an impulsive opposition against 'Scholasticism', and at the same time a naive lack of understanding for the common attitude of dependence upon some one of its traditions, which they nevertheless all occupy".[3]

In the case of Bacon the dependence was on the scholastic notion of causality and the four-fold Aristotelian classification of causes. He wanted to proceed from the study of nature to the "form" of all things through the process of Induction.

The key to modernity in both Descartes and Kant lay in their application of *mathematics* to the philosophy of nature. In this sense Kelpler was more sensitive than Bacon to the mathematics of motion as the key to the understanding of nature, and Galileo developed machanics as the mathematical theory of motion. While Bacon goes for "forms", Galileo seeks the measurable, the mathematical, the experimentable. *Geo-metry,* measurement of the earth, becomes the key to certainty.

Both Descartes and Kant sought to rescue the western world from the scepticism of the Greeks by providing a "Method" of sure, certain, self-certifying knowledge not dependent on Tradition. To start from the simple and most self-evident truth, and then to advance by mathematical procedures to more complex and not-so-apparent truths—this is what Descartes attempted. *Cogito, ergo sum* is the one indubitable fact—the fact of the doubting consciousness which is beyond doubt. Augustine had come upon this insight already in the 5th century and there need be no doubt that Descartes got the principle from his reading of Augustine under the Jesuits with whom he studied. The Greeks and Latins had, for Augustine, overthrown all certainty. The Sceptics, who had been drawn largely from the Latin Academy (Pyrrhon, Arcesilaus, Carneades, Clitomachus, Aenesidemus etc.,) had denied the possibility to know the nature of things. Pyrrhon[4] himself (ca 360 B. C. to 270 B. C.), founder of the Sceptic school had taught that man cannot attain to truth, but can know only appearances; that the search for truth had

3. *Op. cit.* Part: IV: Ch. 2: 30 p. 383
4. It seems Pyrrhon never left any philosophical writings. We are dependent on his disciple Timon for his teaching. See L. Robin, *Pyrrho et la scepticism grec*, 1944.

no solid basis or starting point; that to every proposition one could oppose a contrary and equally probable proposition; that the wise man should therefore abstain from passing judgements.

Modern philosophy, one could say, is the fight against the peril of scepticism. Carneades (ca 214—129 B. C.) the outstanding Sceptic philosopher and founder of the Third Academy, had performed that set of two fine speeches in Rome in 155 B. C., one for justice, and the other against justice, both so equally convincing—that Cato the Elder, Censor of Rome had to expel him from Rome. Cleitomachus, student and successor of Carneades, was a Carthaginian and Augustine knew the writings of these sceptics. For him the only indubitable point was the existence of the fact of doubting and of the doubting consciousness.

Augustine started with the fact of doubt and the existence of the doubter. Descartes, more than a millenium later, found the same indubitable starting point—the indubitable fact of thinking and therefore the existence of the thinking consciousness.

Descartes was only 23, when he shut himself up alone in a stove-heated room in mid-winter[5] and sought an indubitable starting point for his cogitations, and a method for arriving at truth by pure individual cogitation, with "the simple resolve to strip oneself of all opinions and beliefs formerly received".

Descartes tried then to do away with Tradition in general and the scholastic tradition in particular; his effort was to start with one indubitable self-evident datum, and from the foundation to build up the architechtonic structure of "truth" using only clear reasoning based on four strict principles; (a) an honest personal judgment, (b) analysis of problems into parts, (c) reasoning from the simple to the more complex and (d) being as exhaustive as possible in exploring alternative possibilities[6].

But Descartes' attempt to pull down the old ramshackle intellectual building of Scholastic tradition and to build a whole new edifice designed and constructed by a single mind was qualified by some other rules, which strike one as being exactly the opposite of what he wanted to do in the architectonic. For example the first of his additional rules related to personal conduct in the intellectual enterprise goes like this:

> "to obey the laws and customs of my country,
> adhering constantly to the religion in which
> by God's grace I had been instructed since
> my childhood"[7].

5. *Discourse on Method.* Part II first and last paras.
6. *Ibid.* Part II
7. *Method.* Part III

So Descartes wants both—a rational architechtonic without tradition, and traditional religion. The assumption is that there is no conflict, at least no unresolvable conflict, between the two. He may have succeeded to his own satisfaction, but to his posterity this reconciliation of the two proved impossible; Enlightenment and Secularization, the twin processes that accompany western modernity, rejected Traditional religion, and decided to place Reason on the throne with the Senses as executives and informants. Critical Rationality and Empiricism thus became the watchwords of modernity.

In Immanuel Kant too, the religious element is strongly there, but his effort was to make the reasoning process independent of all religious propositions. He saw three worlds—the world of nature, the world of mind or consciousness, and the transcendent world. Pure reason was no use in understanding the third. Reason did achieve some understanding of the world of nature but by a process which had been unexamined. Critical reason had to turn back upon itself, make the mind-world its object, and analyze, not the noemata which the later and full-fledged phenomenologists analyzed, but the noetic process itself. Before we could make the world of nature properly our object, we have to make reason itself an object, analyze its processes and laws, name the categories of the understanding and forms of intuition which a *priori* determine how we understand the world of nature, and discover its limits.

Pure Reason, for Kant, can deal with only objects that confront our sensibility, and neither religion nor values can be in this category and the pure understanding is thus useless for religion and ethics.

Kant was seeking to establish modern philosophy on a secure basis, by ruling out certain disputed areas out of the discourse, by focussing on the process of the understanding as it forms concepts, by determining *a priori* the categories that determine the understanding and shape its products. The question, of course, which Hegel raised, and which Jurgen Habermas has restated recently, is "what is the process by which the knowing process is known; if it is not the same as the process by which external objects are known, what is the validation for the knowledge about knowledge?"[8] If empirical testing is part of what constitutes modernity, then certainly Kant's Transcendental Logical (Transzendentallogisch) method is speculative, unscientific and unmodern.

---

8. Jurgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interest*, Eng. Tr. Jeremy J. Shapiro, Beacon Press, Boston, 1971, p. 7. The phrasing of the question above is my own.

Hegel's solution was, of course, worse than Kant's according to Habermas. The great idealist philosopher simply dismissed the problem about the reliability of knowledge as merely psychological, an unjustified fear of error. But that was precisely the point of modern science and modern philosophy, to reduce the fear of error by having objective standards of measurement and testing. Thus Hegel too fails to qualify as a modern philosopher.

But his critique of Kant still stands. There is no way of ultimately validating the knowing process by any analysis of that process itself; the knowing mind, in the knowing process, is a subjective agent; but in being known, it is transformed into a known object, and then a new mind as knowing subject has to appear on the scene to effect this knowing of the knowing mind. The knowing ego slips away every time we try to fix our attention on it, and in place of the knowing subject that we wanted to know, a known object appears. At the same time as the old knowing subject disappears and is transformed into a known object, a new knowing subject appears as the knower and we cannot get hold of this knower as it is, i. e. as knowing subject; for the very moment we reflect on this knower, he is transformed into the known.

The knowledge of the knowing process thus remains problematic, and inadequate as certification for the reliability of the knowledge yielded by the process. It was this problem which the neokantians like Ernst Cassirer and Susan Langer sought to solve but with no dramatic success, that has recently been picked up by Hans-Georg Gadamer in a new framework.

More or less rejecting Hegel's proposal to understand the knowing mind in terms of its origins[9] rather than its functioning, Gadamer goes to the roots of the subjectivist-historicist tradition popularized by Dilthey and Heidegger, and proposes the hermenuetical principle that all knowledge is fore-knowledge, i. e. that the knowing act is basically a thetic one, in which the perceiving mind projects a particular concept from within itself to the external object seeking confirmation or repudiation.[10]

---

9. i. e. through understanding (a) the process by which the socialization of the individual takes place; (b) the universal history of humankind, and (c) through the three forms of the Absolute Mind, namely religion, art and science, through which history moves.

10. Gadamer puts it this way: "The hermeneutical experience is concerned with what has been transmitted in tradition. This is what is to be experienced. But tradition is not simply a process that we learn to know and be in command of through experience; it is language i. e. it expresses itself like a "Thou". A 'Thou' is not an object but stands in a relationship with us". *Truth & Method*, Eng. Tr. p. 321. His point is that all knowledge is a dialogue with Tradition.

German thinking, which despises Anglo-Saxon rationality as philistine and somewhat commercial,[11] wants something more integral, and the *geisteswissenschaft* literally created by Wilhelm Dilthey, and used by Windelband, Rickert, Simmel, Webber and others, serves as an integrating category for meaningful understanding ('deutend verstehen' of Max Weber) of all reality, social or physical.

And yet neither Dilthey nor Gadamer would claim that their theories are empirically verifiable or falsifiable.. What they insist is that this Anglo-Saxon insistence on objective standards of verifiability almost to the point of denying any function for the subjective in knowledge, is both foolhardy and impractical.

Anglo Saxon Philosophy of Science has today come full circle to the acknowledgement that "objectivity" devoid of any subjective element and "proof" are both unattainable in Science.[12]

There is correspondingly a collapse of this great faith in something called "modernity" in philosophy. Philosophy in the west is in a *cul-de-sac*, perhaps in three or four different *culs-de-sac*.. Neither Linguistic-Analytical philosophy, nor Phenomonology or Existentalism, yes, not even Structuralism or Game Theory of knowledge, have been able to certify themselves as reliable ways of approaching reality.

Marxism, and the German Hermeneutic School, by allowing the idea that Science is a human construction gained in the process of dealing with reality, one that is never final and ever dynamic, always open to critical re-examination, have kept one element of modernity, namely the insistence that all knowledge should be doubted and subjected to criticism. They have only partially been able to maintain the other element of modernity, namely empirical verification or certification.

What has not yet happened on a wide scale in the west is a recurrence of the kind of scepticism popularized in the Third Academy of Carneades (214–129 BC) and Clitomachus (2nd cent. BC). Nor have they known our kind of scepticism—the brutal dialectic of Nagarjuna, or the *Prasangika-Madhyamikas* in general who delighted

11. "a philistine culture with a void at the centre lacking anything worth being called a philosophy i. e. any kind of conceptual thinking that tries to make sense of life as a whole, or even of the social order in which culture is embedded"—Georg Lichtheim *Lukacs*, Fontana/Collins, 1970, p. 23.

12. Professor Imre Lakatos says "........now very few philosophers or scientists still think that scientific knowledge, is or can be, proven knowledge. But few realize that with this the whole classical structure of intellectual values falls in ruins and has to be replaced........" *Criticism and The Growth of Knowledge*. p. 92.

in demolishing other people's theories about essence and existence, function and causality, being and non-being and all the rest.

But it may be the case, that with the collapse of the alleged foundations of modernity, which seems imminent at least in some of the developed market economy countries of the west, they too may come to a greater modernity by reviving the traditions of Vedanta or Madhyamika or Taoist philosophies.

It may become more modern given the present trends, to see empirical reality merely as *pravartika-satta* or *samvrti-satya*, or as the *Tao* in its *Wu* (nothing) form. The west may study again Sankara and Nagarjuna and Kumarajiva and Chung-Tzu and Tao-sheng, and find new meaning and new modernity in them. They have already for some time been exposed to Yoga and Zen in their more elementary and practical forms.

Conclusion

Modernity was basically a reaction against tradition, a desire to develop a critical rationality based on reason and experience alone without any dependence on tradition. It is this attempt that has failed. In Hans-Georg Gadamer the west has come full circle and recognized the inescapability of some dependence on tradition seen as the linguistic, conceptual and methodological as well as cultural equipment that we inherit from our societies and which we carry with us in all acts of understanding.

The problem has been, however, that the west was too heavily dependent on one particular tradition, namely that of classical scholasticism born out of latin rationalization of the Greek classics. In repudiating this tradition, and seeking to start out afresh led by Kant and Descartes, they have now come to recognize that there is no knowledge possible without tradition. Both Descartes and Kant were mistaken. Descartes thought he could demolish the ramshackle (carelessly constructed) intellectual house his generation had inherited, and single-handedly build a new one, designed and constructed by a single mind. His method was to start from one indubitable premiss (*cogito, ergo sum*) of the individual consciousness and thence, by careful logic construct an edifice of thought. This edifice is now crumbling. So is Kant's. Kant thought that he could analyze the world of mind through which the world of objects was perceived and thereby arrive at sure and certain knowledge. He too has failed. The process by which the mind itself is made an object of the understanding is certainly not well established or universally accepted. There is no system at all which honestly establishes the objectivity of the external world. It seems such a solid world exists only in very superficial philosophy. This is what modern philosophy demonstrates.

Structuralism and Game Theories are epistemologically efforts of an affluent society to accept the world as simply given, and not to ask any deep questions about the meaning of the total structure itself or the total game. They are younger theories which may last a little longer before proving themselves to be sterile.

What we need today, it seems to me, is a recovery of and re-entry into the universal tradition of philosophy as the search for true wisdom. Here the west, as well as those of us brought up in a western system of education, should develop the courage and the openness to enter into other aspects of the human tradition. This cannot be done by individuals alone. Only when a body like the Indian Philosophical Congress or similar bodies in other countries can wake up from their varying species of dogmatic slumber do we have some hope that philosophy instead of pursuing any false ideal of modernity, can once again become the light of humanity, lighting the way to wisdom and truth and fulfilment.

Dialogue between Oriental Orthodox and Byzantine Orthodox

Perspectives of Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra

One of the distinguished and well-known representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, His Grace Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Myra gave a presentation in Vienna, Austria on Oct. 29, 1979 on the future perspectives of Dialogue between Oriental Orthodox Churches and Orthodox Churches in communion with Constantinople. The meeting was sponsored by the Ecumenical Foundation Pro Oriente, under the leadership of H. E. Cardinal Konig of Vienna. We give below a summary of his main points as given in EPISKEPSIS (19th Nov. 1979).

After having given a brief resume of the unofficial theological conversations in the past, the speaker said that already in 1951, on the occasion of the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon, the Ecumenical Patriarch had said in his encyclical letter, among other things.

> "And now we turn our thoughts affectionately towards our brothers who are separated from us since the times of the Council, even though, in the words of St. John Damascone, they remain Orthodox, and as such, are held by us with the honour and love accorded without reservation to brothers."

> "It is time now to remove all obstacles we find on the road to our rapprochement and reunion, and that by an effort which is both intensive and common. This effort, we wish to assure everyone, will have our full support and can count on all our goodwill, as well as that of the ecumenical throne".

However, says Metropolitan Chrysostomos, this early atmosphere of optimism was followed a few years later by a certain disenchantment as one began to see the difficulties that this dialogue, like other dialogues of an ecumenical character, brought up. These difficulties kept cropping up every time the discussion proceeded beyond a certain point. They stem from historical and psychological factors arising out of the many centuries of separation and alienation between our churches; thus they are "non-theological in origin; one should not forget the "national" or in the case of the Oriental Orthodox Churches even "multi-national", racial, linguistic and cultural factors, nor, of course, the theological and dogmatic factors.

Metropolitan Chrysostomos went on to quote the propositions of Egyptian Patriarch Pope Shenooda to the Inter-Orthodox (Byzantine) Commission for Dialogue with Ancient Oriental Churches (in Spring 1979).

> "I propose that we discuss our faith of today, for the study of ancient history can become an obstacle. For, permit me to say this to you, each church has written its own history in such a way as to support its own position. Which of these is the true history? That will no doubt be a delicate point for our dialogue. I speak now from the position of an objective and neutral observer. For, of course, as a Copt, I believe that our history books are better. So let us not lose our time discussing questions of history but let us concentrate our discussion on our faith of today, laying aside the quarrels of our fore-fathers".

Despite these difficulties, Metropolitan Chrysostomos expressed his confident hope that the steps taken upto now already constitute many positive achievements for the progress of the dialogue.

These steps are:

(a) The four theological conversations between Byzantine Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox theologians (Aarhus, 1964, Bristol 1967, Geneva 1970 and Addis Ababa 1971);

(b) The creation, immediately after these conversations, of an Inter-Orthodox (Byzantine) commission which should represent the Eastern Orthodox Churches with the Oriental Orthodox Churches, as also the two meetings of this Commission plenary, in Addis Ababa, 1971 and at Chambesy in 1979;

(c) The meetings of the subcommissions of the Eastern Orthodox Oriental Orthodox mixed commission, for fixing the details of the method of and topics for discussion in preparation for the official dialogue (Penteli 1973 and Addis Ababa 1975);

(d) The meeting of the Conference of Heads of Oriental Orthodox Churches since 1965, as also of its Standing Committee (Addis Ababa, 1965, Cairo 1966, Antelias, 1967 Atchana-Lebanon 1972 and others);

(e) The four theological conversations at Vienna between Roman Catholic and Oriental Orthodox theologians at the initiative of the Foundation *Pro Oriente* (1971, 1973, 1976, 1978);

(f) The five meetings of the Joint Commission between the Roman Catholic and the Coptic Orthodox Churches (Cairo 1974, 1975, Vienna 1976, Cairo 1978 and Rome 1979).

One should add, said Metropolitan Chrysostomos, also the important meetings between Oriental Orthodox heads and prelates with Ecumenical Patriarchs Athenagoras and Dimitrios as well as with other Eastern Orthodox heads of churches, the texts of joint declarations as well as speeches on these occasions; the visits of Oriental Orthodox heads of churches to Pope Paul VI accompanied often by joint Christological declarations, exchanges of visit by church delegations, the individual contributions of theologians on issues related to the dialogue.

Proceeding to the central issues, the Metropolitan referred first to the Christological problem. He cited the opinion of Prof. John Karmiris (formerly of Athens University), according to whom "the divergence of opinion of the Oriental Orthodox appear to refer not so much to the essence as to the formulation of the teaching of the Council of Chalcedon regarding the union of the two natures in Christ".

The Metropolitan also referred to the proposal made during the 2nd and 3rd unofficial theological conversations (Bristol 1967 and Geneva 1970) that a common declaration of Christological faith be prepared, for the purpose of clarifying the positions. Such a declaration according to the Bristol proposal, will not have the character of a confession of faith or a creed, and as the Geneva declaration said, will not contain any new elements on the part of the one or the other, but would provide an interpretation of the faith that has been conserved in tact on both sides for centuries. The theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria, the decisions of 433, the patristic and liturgical texts on both sides, can all be incorporated in this joint declaration. The terminology should not be used in an imprecise manner in order to cover up real differences of opinion, but only in order to give expression to the agreement that really exists already.

The speaker went on to say that all this together were not to be regarded as the totality of the elements necessary for a new christological formula, but simply as a hermeneutical or interpretatory declaration. It is only in this sense that the Orthodox could accept it.

He also stated: "We have approached the christological question from a soteriological (doctrine of salvation) perspective. We have gone back to the Fathers. In basing ourselves on their teaching, we have discovered the complete rapport between christology and soteriology, as also the rapport between these and the doctrines of God, of humanity and of the Spirit.

"As regards the consubstantiality (*homoousion*) of the Word Incarnate with us, the report says: "The infinite love of God for the

human race is our point of departure for apprehending the mystery of the union of the full divine nature with the full human nature in our Saviour Jesus Christ. It is this love which has made him, while remaining consubstantial with the Father, assume by his incarnation the same nature as ours'".

On the second important point of his address, i.e. the recognition of the later councils and especially the Council of Chalcedon by the Oriental Orthodox Churches, the Metropolitan said:

> "Between us and the pre-chalcedonian Orientals, there exists a very large common theological basis, especially on the fundamental structures of the Church, e.g. priesthood, episcopate, apostolic succession, conciliarity, the infallibility of the Church, the common mind of the faithful and the ecclesiastical teaching office; but also, in a much larger sense, the whole sphere of the operation and mission of the Holy Spirit in the Church, of the Church as communion of saints, of the Sacraments and of the Last Things. (See Report of 3rd meeting at Geneva 1967)......

The Metropolitan did not overlook a number of ecclesiological differences which make an agreement with the Oriental Orthodox difficult. He mentioned (a) the distinction between dogmatic definitions and Canon laws in the council decisions (b) the meaning of conciliarity in general and above all the distinction between two categories of councils; the first three which are acceptable for all and the four later ones which the Oriental Orthodox consider as having significance only for the Byzantine Orthodox.

As regards the point of view of the Oriental Orthodox that the ecumenical councils should be considered more as charismatic events in the life of the Church rather than as an authority above the Church, the Metropolitan said:

> "The ecumenical council though never considered as a permanent institution within the Church or as a stable and regular form of its authority, did however, represent a pneumatological and ecclesiological dimension which transforms its (on condition of its *a posteriori* reception by the people of God) into an event expressing the supreme authority of the Church. It is for this reason precisely that the (Byzantine) Orthodox Church should not give up the universal acceptance of the seven ecumenical councils, even though she is fully aware that the acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon on the part of the non-Chalcedonians presents almost insurmountable difficulties. It is there that we find one of the least easy points in the discussion between the Eastern Orthodox and the Oriental Orthodox Churches".

Coming then to the specifically ecclesiological problem the Metropolitan expressed the view that the ecclesiology of the Byzantine Orthodox was exactly midway between the ecclеisology of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Oriental Orthodox Churches.

> "The Orient has not felt, during the course of its long history, the need to develop a specific theology of the Primacy in the Church. In the Oriental Orthodox Churches, in fact, the institution of Patriarchs or Catholicoi has fully sufficed to give to their churches a de facto unity conceived and lived practically. On the contrary the Byzantine Orthodox Church, without adhering to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on the significance they attribute to the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, still has a theology concerning "the first" or "the first ones", of course in the context of conciliarity and the co-responsibility of bishops within the canonical structures of autocephaly".

And the Metropolitan concluded by making his own the affirmation of the 1975 Vienna meeting between Roman Catholics and Oriental Orthodox:

> "The unity we seek to realise in the future and in which our two apostolic churches, in equality and mutual respect, will come again into full communion, on the basis of the faith, the tradition and the ecclesial life of the undivided church of the first four and a half centuries, shall be a real unity".

Love as the Good

Renewal in Orthodox Spirituality, (Courtesy, EPISKEPSIS)

Alas, only those who read French can benefit from the new series "*Theophanie*" under publication by Desclee de Brouwer, which will deal mainly with Orthodox liturgy and spirituality. The stated purpose of the publishers is to bring East and West closer together. But the Orthodox themselves can benefit from these series, for we are quite backward even in acquaintance with our own heritage. The editor of the series is Olivier Clement, a well-known French Orthodox writer who was not born into an Orthodox family. He came to Orthodoxy from a sort of liberal agnosticism, and has now become an ardent apostle of Orthodoxy among French speaking people.

Three books have already appeared in the series in 1978, each of the three with a very important preface from Olivier Clement. Two of these books are by that other famous and venerable French-speaking lay Orthodox theologian Paul Eudokimov, who died a few years ago. One of these books in Eudokimov's doctoral thesis, defended in 1942 at the French University of Aix-en-Provence, on *Dostoievsky and the Problem of Evil.* Dostoievsky, according to Eudokimov, was more than a mere psychological and literary genius. He was above all a great theologian with an articulate doctrine of man and a clear pneumatology. God respects humanity's freedom so much that He has chosen to keep His power and presence hidden in order not to stifle human freedom. As a consequence faith in God cannot be imposed upon man by law or force, by logic or persuasion, or by any other form of necessity. It has to be freely chosen, and involves a trusting commitment to the life of love and sacrifice. Life and Love—that is what God is, and what His image, man, also has to be. By the life of love humanity participates in the life of the Transcendent. The life of faith is not mere intellectual commitment, it is a total transfiguration of human personality.

This freedom of man—says Eudokimov, is still important even if man, following the Enemy of Life and Love, the Devil, chooses to fight against God. The interesting argument of Eudokimov is that Evil is not merely the absence of the good—a passive non-being; it is rather an active defiance of the good and the desire to live, even if one has to murder for that purpose. But in so far as it is a will to live, even this defiance of God participates in God's character as will to live.

Dostoievsky's passionate defence of human personal freedom has been used in an anti-communist context, the communist state being conceived as a minority imposing its will on the majority and thus trampling on their freedom. But it could be used also in the other sense. The Atheist's will to be alive and his revolt against God are also part of his freedom and of his will to live, and thus in some sense participate in the nature of God.

The best example in Dostoievsky is of course the magnificent chapter on The Grand Inquisitor where it is the Catholic Church which is accused of replacing the Gospel of freedom and love by the trilogy of miracle, mystery and authority. The desire to negate and suppress the other, is the characteristic of the Devil, and the west, say Dostoievsky and Eudokimov, is much more tempted in this regard than the East, both in politics and in Church. We do not like to conform to the image of a God who hides himself, makes himself powerless and lets the other be.

Eudokimov is an ardent witness to the God who empties himself and who does not wish to dominate. This is clear also in his other work *Woman and the Salvation of the World,* where he insists that in the Body of Christ, in the earthly and heavenly body of the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world, the king and the beggar, the priest and the prophet, man and woman, clergy and laity, all are of equal value. It is God's imprint and image which is in each one by the Holy Spirit. Eudokimov holds that woman par excellence is the bearer of the Holy Spirit, because the kenotic image is most evident in her and least evident in the Male who, warrier or technologist, always manages to dominate, to suppress, to dehumanize and to destroy the image.

The third volume is from Andre Borrely, and provides an exposition on *Philokalia,* the collection of the wise sayings of the Fathers of the Church, a collection probably started by Mar Baselios and developed in the monastic movement. The *Philokalia* (love of good things) came to have a privileged position in the Hesychast monastic movement (typified in the monasteries of Mount Athos in Greece). This 14th century Byzantine monastic movement developed an elaborate set of meditation methods and yoga practices to induce perfect tranquillity of body and mind, as a means to attaining the "beatific vision" of the Uncreated Light of the God-head—the mystical light of God's visible Presence, the Light of Tabor (See Vladimir Lossky's *Vision of God* for deeper understanding of this). Though this light was never regarded as the vision of the Being (*ousia*) of God, what one was seeing in this light is the uncreated *energeia* of God which sustains all created reality. *Philokalia* then came to signify the love of the Uncreated Light, and Hesychasm, as quiet of body and soul, inner peace and a sense of indescribable joy flowing from the mystical

union with God, became its expression. Mr. Borrely takes this particular Byzantine spirituality into the context of the Eucharist, and develops a concept of spirituality less individualistic, more communitarian-liturgical and cosmic, uniting the whole of humanity and the creation itself with God. The community itself is thus to be transfigured and become the "sacramental" presence of God in the world.

Philokalia is known to the Oriental Orthodox, but not in a Hesychast context. These ancient churches never took part in the Barlaam—Palamas controversy of the Byzantine and western churches in the 14th and subsequent centuries. Nevertheless, it seems necessary for us once again to bring into being a new Philokalia. Perhaps some day the monks of Amba Makarius in Egypt and of Mount Athos Greece will come together to explore together the common monastic and spiritual heritage and to create a *Philokalia* for our time based on the old but related to the problems of the modern world.

Meanwhile someone should undertake an English translation of these very useful French publications.

The Mixed Catholic-Orthodox Commission for Theological Dialogue

L'osservatore Romano

We publish a list of the members of the mixed Catholic Byzantine Orthodox Commission for theological dialogue, which was announced on Friday, 30 November, at the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople by Pope John Paul II and Patriarch Dimitrios I.

Catholic Members

—His Eminence Cardinal Johannes G. M. Willebrands, Archbishop of Utrecht, President of the Secretariat for the Union of Christians;

—His Eminence Cardinal William Wakefield Baum, Archbishop of Washington;

—His Eminence Cardinal George Basil Hume, Archbishop of Westminister;

—His Eminence Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, Archbishop of Munich and Freising;

—His Eminence Cardinal Roger Etchegaray, Archbishop of Marseilles;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Mario Brini, titular Archbishop of Algiza, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Churches.

—His Excellency Most Rev. Nicolas Foscolos, Archbishop of Athens;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Habib Bacha, Archbishop of Beirut and Gilbail of the Melkites;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Mariano Magrassi, Archbishop of Bari;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Alfred Pichler, Bishop of Banjaluka;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Ramon Torrella Cascante, titular Bishop of Minervium, Vice-President of the Secretariat for the Union of Christians;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Antal Jakab, titular Bishop of Astigi, Coadjutor with the right of succession of the Bishop of Alba Julia;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Miroslav Marusyn, titular Bishop of Cadi, Vice-President of the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Oriental Canon Law;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Georges Abi-Sader, Bishop of Lataquie of the Maronites;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Alfons Nossol, Bishop of Opole;

—Rev. Mons. Michele Maccarrone, President of the Pontifical Committee of Historical Sciences;

—Rev. Jean Corbon, Secretary of the Ecumenical Commission of the Assembly of the Patriarchs and the Catholic Bishops of Lebanon;

—Rev. Professor Frederic McManus, Lecturer in Canon Law at the Catholic University of America;

—Rev. Professor Dimitri Salachas of the clergy of Athens, Lecturer in Canon Law in the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas;

—Rev. Professor Ernst Suttner, Lecturer in Patrology and in Oriental Theology in the University of Vienna;

—Rev. Professor Hermann Vogt, Lecturer in Patrology in the University of Tubingen;

—Rev. Emmanuel Lanne, O. S. B., of the Monastery of Chevetogne;

—Rev. Professor Jean M. R. Tillard, O. P., Lecturer in the Dominican Faculty of Theology in Ottawa;

—Rev. Professor Andre de Halleux, O. F. M., Lecturer in Patrology and Oriental Theology in the University of Louvain;

—Rev. Professor Miguel Arranz, S. J., Lecturer in Liturgy in the Pontifical Oriental Institute;

—Rev. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S. J., Provincial for the Middle East;

—Rev. Louis Bouyer of the Oratory of France;

—Rev. Professor Waclaw Hryniewicz, O. M. I., Lecturer in the University of Lublin;

—Rev. Professor P. van Aalst, A. A. Lecturer in Oriental Theology in the University of Nijmegen;

—Dr. Vittorio Peri, of the Apostolic Vatican Library;

—Rev. Pierre Duprey, Under-secretary of the Secretariat for the Union of Christians, Co-secretary of the Commission.

Orthodox Members

Ecumenical Patriarchate

—His Eminence Most Rev. Stylianos, Greek-Orthodox Archbishop of Australia;

—Professor John Zizioulas.

Patriarchate of Alexandria

—His Excellency Most Rev. Parthenios, Metropolitan of Carthage;

—His Excellency Most Rev. Timotheos, Metropolitan of Central Africa (substitute).

—Professor Stylianos Papadopoulos.

Patriarchate of Antioch

—His Excellency Most Rev. Georges Khodr, Metropolitan of Mont Liban.

Patriarchate of Jerusalem

—His Excellency Most Rev. Germanos, Metropolitan of Petra;

—Professor Georges Galitis;

—Professor Vlassios Pheidas.

Patriarchate of Moscow

—His Excellency Most Rev. Kyrill, Archbishop of Vyborg;

—Rev. Archpriest Livery Voronov.

Patriarchate of Serbia

—His Excellency Most Rev. Savvas, Bishop of Sumadija;

—Rev. Deacon Radomir Rakic.

Patriarchate of Rumania

—His Eminence Most Rev. Nicolae, Metropolitan of Banat.

Patriarch of Bulgaria

—His Excellency Most Rev. Ioan, Bishop of Dragovit.

Church of Cyprus

—His Excellency Most Rev. Chrysantos, Metropolitan of Morphou;

—Mr. Makarios Papachristoforou.

Church of Greece

—His Excellency Most Rev. Chrysostomos, Metropolitan of Peristeriou;

—Professor John Karmiris;

—Professor Megas Farantos.

Church of Georgia

—His Excellency Most Rev. Nikolai, Bishop of Sukhumi and Abkhazia.

Church of Finland

—Rev. Matti Sidorof;

—Hieromoine Ambroise.

Other members are still to be added to the list.

Joint Declaration of Pope John Paul II and Patriarch Dimitrios I

The ecumenical movement took an important step forward on Friday 30 November, 79. In the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople, John Paul II and Dimitrios I signed a joint Declaration in which they announced the start of the theological dialogue between the two Churches and the constitution of the mixed Catholic-Orthodox Commission which will be responsible for it. The text is as follows:

We, Pope John II, and the Ecumenical Patriarch Dimitrios I, give thanks to God who has granted us the possibility of meeting to celebrate together the feast of the apostle Andrew, the one first called and the brother of the apostle Peter. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us in Christ with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places" Eph. 1:3.

Seeking only the glory of God through the accomplishment of his will, we affirm again our resolute determination to do everything possible to hasten the day when full communion will be re-established between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church and when we will at last be able to concelebrate the divine Eucharist.

We are grateful to our predecessors, Pope Paul VI ånd Patriarch Athenagoras I, for everything they did to reconcile our Churches and cause them to progress in unity.

The progress made in the preparatory stage permits us to announce that the theological dialogue is about to begin and to make public the list of the members of the mixed Catholic-Orthodox Commission that will be responsible for it.

This theological dialogue aims not only at progressing towards the re-establishment of full communion between the Catholic and Orthodox sister-Churches, but also at contributing to the multiple dialogues that are developing in the Christian world in search of its unity.

The dialogue of charity (cf. Jn 13:34; Eph 4:1–7), rooted in complete faithfulness to the one Lord Jesus Christ and to his will over his Church (cf. Jn 17:21), has opened up the way to better

understanding of our mutual theological positions and thereby, to new approaches to the theological work and to a new attitude with regard to the common past of our Churches. This purification of the collective memory of our Churches is an important fruit of the dialogue of charity and an indispensable condition of future progress. This dialogue of charity must continue and be intensified in the complex situation which we have inherited from the past, and which constitutes the reality in which our effort must take place today.

We want the progress in unity to open up new possibilities of dialogue and collaboration with believers of other religions, and with all men of goodwill, in order that love and brotherhood may prevail over hatred and opposition among men. We hope to contribute in this way to the coming of true peace in the world. We implore this gift of him who was, who is, and who will be, Christ our one Saviour and our real peace.

Phanar, on the feast of St. Andrew 1979.

News and Views

WCC Rejoices in Pope John Paul II's visit to The Ecumenical Patriarchate

Geneva (EPS)—The general secretary of the World Council of Churches, Dr. Philip Potter, has expressed the hope that Pope John Paul II's visit to the Ecumenical Patriarch, Dimitrios I, "will constitute a new step towards the anxiously longed for Christian Unity". In a cable addressed to the Patriarch on 28 November, Dr. Potter declared: "We rejoice in Pope John Paul II's visit to Your Holiness in the footsteps of Pope Paul VI, who, in 1967, met with Patriarch Athenagoras I". This message was sent on the occasion of St. Andrew's day (30 November), the patron saint of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the celebrations of which will be attended by the Pope. The head of the Roman Catholic Church will lead the Catholic delegation which, since 1976, has attended the St. Andrew's day celebrations. A delegation of the Ecumenical Patriarchate regularly visits Rome on 29 June, for the celebration of St. Peter and St. Paul.

In announcing his visit to Turkey on 18 November, Pope John Paul II declared that this visit was of great importance "because it shows the Pope's decision to pursue efforts towards the unity of all Christians", which is, "now more than ever, an urgent necessity" he added. This visit, is intended to show the importance the Catholic Church places on theological dialogue", which must take place with the Orthodox Churches in order to overcome existing divisions.

The full text of Dr. Potter's message reads: "The celebration of the patron saint's day of the Ecumenical Patriarch offers me the opportunity to express warm and friendly greetings on behalf of the WCC. In this moment of trials and crisis, the spiritual and moral values of the martyrdom of St. Andrew are a source of inspiration and hope for everyone. We rejoice in Pope John Paul II's visit to your Holiness in the footsteps of Pope Paul VI, who, in 1967, met with Patriarch Athenagoras I. We hope that this visit will constitute a new stage towards the anxiously desired Christian unity. May God preserve Your Holiness and Your Venerable Church.

Vischer to direct Protestant Office for Ecumenism

Bern (EPS)—Dr. Lukas Vischer has accepted the post of director of the Protestant Office for Ecumenism, in Switzerland, a position specially created for him by the German speaking Swiss Protestant

Churches. Dr. Vischer's present position as director of the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches expires at the end of this year but he will only begin his new appointment in Bern on 1 October, 1980. Until that time he will carry out personal theological research.

The Protestant Office for Ecumenism in Switzerland will promote understanding of the ecumenical movement in the Swiss parishes. The main tasks of the director will be to lecture at theological faculties, initiate theological themes judged particularly important to the Swiss Churches, be in contact with the ecclesiastical authorities, parishes, ecumenical working groups, as well as with ecumenical officers of the Churches and, finally, to stimulate ecumenical contacts abroad.

Dr. Vischer, 53, has been director of the WCC's Commission on Faith and Order, since July, 1966. Before he began his work with the WCC in 1961 he was a minister in Herblingen, near Schaffhausen Switzerland. He was one of the WCC's observers to all the sessions of the Second Vatican Council, and is co-secretary of the Joint Working Group of the Roman Catholic Church and the WCC.

New Director chosen for Faith and Order Commission

Geneva (EPS)—A US theologian who is currently director of the Department of Church and Society, Lutheran Church of America, Dr. William Henry Lazareth, has accepted a call from the World Council of Churches to become director of the Commission on Faith and Order.

The 51 year-old Lutheran pastor is visiting professor of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. He studied in the United States at Princeton University, Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University (where he obtained his doctorate), and abroad in the Federal Republic of Germany and Sweden. He has participated in many ecumenical events, including assemblies of the WCC and of the Lutheran World Federation (LWF), as well as in conversations with Orthodox and Roman Catholics. From 1968 to 1975 Dr. Lazareth was a member of the Faith and Order Standing Commission.

Dr. Lazareth's appointment was officially endorsed by the WCC Central Committee through mail vote after being proposed by the Standing Commission and approved by the WCC's Executive Committee. Dr. Lazareth will assume his new responsibilities officially on 1 May 1980.

For the interim period between the departure of Dr. Lukas Vischer, present director of the Commission on Faith and Order, on 31 December and Dr. Lazareth's arrival, the Commission's associate director, Dr. C. S. Song from Taiwan, will serve as acting director.

The Standing Commission has also appointed Brother Max Thurian of the Taize community as moderator of the Steering Group which is to conclude the Commission's work towards theological consensus on the statements on baptism, eucharist and ministry. Brother Max has been research consultant to the Faith and Order Commission for many years.

Support for Schillebeeckx from British Theologians

London (EPS)—Eighty-three British academic theologians—Catholics, Anglicans, Presbyterians and Free Churchmen—have signed a letter to "The Times" (Saturday, 1 December) protesting against the Vatican's treatment of the Belgian Dominican theologian Edward Schillebeeckx in summoning him to Rome to answer questions about the orthodoxy of his writings put by the Doctrinal Congregation, the former Holy Office.

The letter acknowledged that any theologian had responsibilities to his particular denominational tradition and that there were likely to be tensions and difficulties between theologians and pastors. But both theologians and pastors had to exercise their responsibilities in a manner consonant with the truth to which they sought to bear witness.

"We believe that measures such as those currently being employed by the (Doctrinal) Congregation are inconsistant with fundamental human rights, gravely threaten that freedom of interpretation and research which is an indispensable feature of the human quest for meaning and truth, discredit the authority which employs such measures, and imperial that fragile climate of mutual trust between the churches which has developed in recent decades," said the 83 theologians.

"Professor Schillebeeckx's reputation as a man whose scholarship and intellectual integrity are internationally respected will not in the long run be harmed by the procedures to which he is subject. We believe, however, that the damage done to the truthfulness and the credibility of the Christian community is likely to be incalculable."

The signatories are headed by Nicholas Lash, Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, the first Catholic to be appointed to a chair at one of the older English universities, who drafted the letter. Other Catholic signatories include three Dominicans, among them Fergus Kerr, one Jesuit, Robert Murray, and Fr. Kevin T. Kelly, Director of the Upholland Northern Institute. Non-Catholic signatories include Professors Henry Chadwick, Geoffrey Lampe, John MacQuarrie, Ninian Smart, James Whyte, Peter Baelz, John Hick, Donald Mackinnon, C. F. D. Moule, Dennis Nineham, John A. T. Robinson, and Maurice Wiles.

In a report in the same issue of "The Times" the paper's religious affairs correspondent, Clifford Longley, described the letter as "without precedent" as an ecumenical act of solidarity. He added that it was understood that a copy was already on its way "by special channels" to the Pope.

News from the Second World

The 42nd Congress of the All (Soviet) Union Council of Evangelical Christians (Baptists), meeting in Moscow in December 1979, was told that in the last 5 years, 203 new Baptist congregations had been formed in the Soviet Union and 34,000 people baptized. The Baptists still train their ministers through correspondence courses. They have trained 272 ministers in the last 11 years. They have recently printed 20,000 Bibles in Leningrad and imported about 150,000 Bibles, New Testaments and Hymn books according to the official report. The congress was representative of some half a million baptists, 30,000 Pentecostals and 20,000 Mennorites in the Soviet Union.

The Lutheran Church in Czechoslovakia has recently received a 29-ton consignment of 50,000 Bibles shipped to them by the United Bible Society with its headquarters in Geneva. The Bibles are in a new Slovak translation. (EPS)

Greece and Vatican Exchange Envoys

The Government of Greece has for the first time established diplomatic relation with the State of Vatican, an official communique dated 14th July 1979 announced the intention to exchange envoys. On the 5th of July, however, the Permanent Synod of the Orthodox Church of Greece, had met and issued a communique expressing its solemn opposition to this proposed agreement. Their stated reason is that the Government of Greece has no theological justification to recognize the Roman Catholic Church as a State. The controversy is still raging (EPS).

Byzantine Orthodox-Roman Catholic Symposium

Some 70 Roman Catholic and Byzantine Orthodox theologians took part in a major annual symposium last summer in Regensburg, West Germany on "The One Church—Seen through common Saints and especially St. Basil the Great." The symposium was organized by Dr. Graber, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Regensburg and Dr. Albert Rauch, the ecumenically well known Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies in Regensburg. This was the seventh of a series of such symposia, held since 1969, held mostly at Regensburg, and once at Athens. Among the Orthodox participants were Metropolitan Ireneus (Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Western Europe), Archbishop Melchisedek (Russian Exarch), Bishop John Dragovich (Rector, Bulgarian Theological Academy), Bishop Gerasimos of

Romania, Cardinal Ratzinger of Munich, Bishop Graber of Regensberg, Bishop Scheele of Paderborn, Prof. Grillmaier (Frankfurt) Prof. de Vries (Rome) Prof. Christon (Thessaloniki), Prof. Theodoron (Rector, Athens).

Most of the papers presented were studies on St. Basil, as was appropriate in the 16th centenary year of the Great Church Father. Also present was Archbishop Roman Torella, Vice-president of the Secretariat for Unity in Rome (*Episkepsis*).

Church Union in Ghana

After conversations that have continued unbroken for 22 years (since 1957), the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches of Ghana are on their way to union. The three uniting churches are the Evangelical Presbyterian Church, the Presbyterian Church of Ghana and the Methodist Church, Ghana. The Angelican Church of Ghana was in the conversations for some 17 years, but withdrew in 1974 when the draft proposals were published. Dr. Christian Baeta, an internationally well-known African Church leader has been Chairman of the Union Committee. Ghana returned to civilian rule on September 24th, 1979.

The All Africa Conference of Churches

The all Africa Conference Churches is now looking for a new General Secretary and the budget to pay its debts and complete its headquarters construction project. Its flamboyant and ebullient General Secretary Canon Burgess Carr of Liberia had to leave Kenya (Nairobi, where A. A. C. C. headquarters are located) under pressure and personal persecution from certain high Kenyan Government officials and has been teaching at Harvard Divinity School. He refused to resign, since he was leaving under pressure. Mr. Kodwo Ankrah, of Ghana who was Refugees Secretary has been acting as General Secretary. Now that Canon Carr's term has expired, they are looking for a new General Secretary. The Kenyan President Mr. Arap Moi, takes a personal interest in the AACC and has given the organization a grace period in which to pay up the loan it took from the State bank for construction of the AACC headquarters which remains unfinished. The AACC needs our prayers.

THE STAR OF THE EAST

THE STAR OF THE EAST is an Indian Orthodox ecumenical quarterly published under the editorial responsibility of Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Gregorios of Delhi (formerly Fr. Paul Verghese). It is the continuation of an occasional journal carrying the same name originally published by the late Rev. Dr. C. T. Eapen of the Orthodox Syrian Church of India. The journal will deal with contemporary issues of ecumenism, especially from the perspective of the Orthodox Churches, and will carry news about the major events in the life of these Churches.

All correspondence, articles, news, exchange periodicals, books for review and subscription enquiries may be addressed to:

The Business Manager,
The Star of the East,
Sophia Centre, P. B. 98,
Kottayam—686 001, S. India.

Single copy in India	Rs.	2.50
,, Outside India	$	1.00

Annual Subscription Rates:

In India	Rs.	10.00
Outside India (By Seamail)	$	4.00
,, (By Airmail)	$	7.00
For Indian Theological Students	Rs.	6.00

Life Subscription:

(In India)	Rs.	150.00
(Outside India)	$	100.00

DO YOU WISH TO HAVE A PART IN THE LIFE CHANGING PROJECT FOR A PERIOD OF SEVEN MONTHS?

If you are a born again Christian willing to serve the Lord, here is an opportunity—for you. It involves continuous travelling in the Villages of India, showing film and explaining God's love.

Minimum Requirements:

1. S. S. L. C.
2. Willing for hard and strenuous work.
3. Men below 35 years with good health.

Write for application form to:

PERSONNEL DEPT.
INDIA CAMPUS CRUSADE FOR CHRIST
P. B. 3885, BANGALORE-560038.